Remarks

Claims 1-37 were pending in the application. Claim 37 is hereby canceled, and claim 39 is hereby added. Therefore, claims 1-36 and 38-39 are pending in the application.

Claims 7 and 8 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.fs

Claims 1-6, 9-12, 14-30 and 32-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by United States Patent No. 6,590,996 issued to Reed et al. on July 8, 2003.

Claims 13 and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Reed et al. in view of United States Patent No. 6,538,599 issued to David on March 25, 2003.

Each of the various rejections and objections are overcome by amendments that are made to the specification, drawing, and/or claims, as well as, or in the alternative, by various arguments that are presented.

Any amendments to any claim for reasons other than as expressly recited herein as being for the purpose of distinguishing such claim from known prior art are not being made with an intent to change in any way the literal scope of such claims or the range of equivalents for such claims. They are being made simply to present language that is better in conformance with the form requirements of Title 35 of the United States Code or is simply clearer and easier to understand than the originally presented language. Any amendments to any claim expressly made in order to distinguish such claim from known prior art are being made only with an intent to change the literal scope of such claim in the most minimal way, i.e., to just avoid the prior art in a way that leaves the claim novel and not obvious in view of the cited prior art, and no equivalent of any subject matter remaining in the claim is intended to be surrendered.

Also, since a dependent claim inherently includes the recitations of the claim or chain of claims from which it depends, it is submitted that the scope and content of any dependent claims that have been herein rewritten in independent form is exactly the same as the scope and content of those claims prior to having been rewritten in independent

form. That is, although by convention such rewritten claims are labeled herein as having been "amended," it is submitted that only the format, and not the content, of these claims has been changed. This is true whether a dependent claim has been rewritten to expressly include the limitations of those claims on which it formerly depended or whether an independent claim has been rewritten to include the limitations of claims that previously depended from it. Thus, by such rewriting no equivalent of any subject matter of the original dependent claim is intended to be surrendered. If the Examiner is of a different view, he is respectfully requested to so indicate.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. 102

Claims 1-6, 9-12, 14-30 and 32-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by United States Patent No. 6,590,996 issued to Reed et al. on July 8, 2003.

The Office Action essentially states that Reed et al. teaches all the limitations of applicant's independent claims. This ground of rejection is respectfully traversed for the following reasons.

Firstly, and perhaps most easily, the Office Action cites column 4, lines 4-14 of Reed et al. as teaching applicant's requirement that the original and replicated bits to be impressed in the same block position in successive frames. However, this is not correct, and Reed et al. does not teach that for which it is cited.

Rather, that section of Reed et al. teaches that the composite watermark may be replicated in blocks of the original image. Thus, there is at best a teaching within Reed et al. to repeat the watermark data **only within a single image**, which, would correspond to a single frame of video. However, there is no teaching in to repeat the bits of the watermark data for **successive frames**, i.e., for multiple images. Likewise, there is no teaching repeat the bits of the watermark data for successive frames in Reed et al. at column 9, lines 12 to column 2, line 41, where replication of data is mentioned. Indeed, the entire processing of Reed et al. seems to be done independently for each image, as Reed et al. appears to be primarily directed to processing only single images. (See, for example the discussion of the use of the images in print at column 36, lines 61-62, as well as the user interface for controlling watermarking, which does not appear to be feasible for a video signal having multiple frames per second, e.g., Reed et al., column 38, line 52

through column 39, line 44.) Thus, there is no teaching or suggestion in Reed et al. that supply the original and replicated bits be impressed in successive frames of a video signal, as required by applicant's independent claims other than independent claim 30.

Furthermore, even if one to take to the notion that Reed et al. teaches replicating bits of the watermark data within successive frames of the video signal, a position with which applicant strongly disagrees, nevertheless, there is clearly no teaching in Reed et al. as to where such repetition should be made. Thus, there is no teaching that repetition be made in the **same block positions** of the frames for which it is repeated, as is required by applicant's independent claims other than independent claim 30.

Additionally, regarding independent claims 1, 20, and 30, while it is true that Reed et al. has certain arrangements that are based on the use of transform domains, Reed et al. does **not** teach to place the bits of watermark data into at least one selected bit of an average value of a chrominance portion over a block of the video signal, as required by applicant's claims 1 29. Rather, Reed et al. teaches employing the average color of the block to look up the corresponding color channels in which to embed the block. (See Reed et al. column 2, lines 40-52, column 38, lines 10-47.) Furthermore, the modifications of the image to add thereto the watermark data by Reed et al. do not place the actual bit values of the watermark data into at least one selected bit of the average value of the chrominance potion of a block.

Since all of the dependent claims that depend from the currently amended independent claims include all the limitations of the respective independent claim from which they ultimately depend, each such dependent claim is also allowable over Reed et al. under 35 U.S.C. 102.

Note that amended claims 36 and 38 are merely former claims 37 and 38, respectively, rewritten in independent form.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

Claims 13 and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Reed et al. in view of United States Patent No. 6,538,599 issued to David on March 25, 2003.

Each of these grounds of rejection applies only to dependent claims, and each is predicated on the validity of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102 given Reed et al. Since the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102 given Reed et al. has been overcome, as described hereinabove, and there is no argument put forth by the Office Action that David supplies that which is missing from Reed et al. to render the independent claims anticipated, and indeed it does not do so. this grounds of rejection cannot be maintained.

Therefore, applicants' claims are allowable over the combination of Reed et al. and David under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

New Claim

New claims 39 have been added to better define applicants' invention. No new matter has been added.

Conclusion

It is respectfully submitted that the Office Action's rejections have been overcome and that this application is now in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and allowance are, therefore, respectfully solicited.

If, however, the Examiner still believes that there are unresolved issues, he is invited to call applicant's attorney so that arrangements may be made to discuss and resolve any such issues.

In the event that an extension of time is required for this amendment to be considered timely, and a petition therefor does not otherwise accompany this amendment, any necessary extension of time is hereby petitioned for, and the Commissioner is authorized to charge the appropriate cost of such petition to the **Lucent Technologies Deposit Account No. 12-2325.**

Respectfully,

M. H. Zarrabizadeh

By _____
Eugene J. Rosenthal, Attorney
Reg. No. 36,658
908-582-4323

Lucent Technologies Inc.

Date: 8/30/07